

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/700,063	10/31/2003	Richard Edwin Warren JR.	RD-27511-1	3737	
6147	7590 08/23/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
GENERAL GLOBAL RI	ELECTRIC COMPA	ELVE, MARIA ALEXANDRA			
	OCKET RM. BLDG. K1	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
NISKAYUNA, NY 12309			1725		

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			<u> </u>	<i> \walder</i>			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/700,063	WARREN ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		M. Alexandra Elve	1725				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	n appears on the cover sh	eet with the correspondence ac	Idress			
THE - External control	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION OF THIS COMMUNICATION OF THIS COMMUNICATION OF THIS COMMUNICATION OF THE WAY OF THE WA	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, on. a reply within the statutory minimule epirod will apply and will expire SIX statute. cause the application to be	may a reply be timely filed m of thirty (30) days will be considered timel (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this come ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. & 133)	ly. xxmmunication.			
Status							
1) 🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	16 June 2005.					
2a)□		This action is non-final.					
3)[
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are pending in the applica 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-3 and 6-22</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) <u>4 and 5</u> is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	ndrawn from consideratio					
Applicat	ion Papers						
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Example The drawing(s) filed on 31 October 2003 is Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the country the oath or declaration is objected to by the	s/are : a) \square accepted or be the drawing(s) be held in a correction is required if the dr	abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). rawing(s) is objected to. See 37 Cl	FR 1.121(d).			
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Business the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been receive nents have been receive priority documents have ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))	d. d in Application No been received in this National	Stage			
Attachmen	t(s)						
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Inte	rview Summary (PTO-413)				
3) 🔲 Infor	te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SI or No(s)/Mail Date		er No(s)/Mail Date ice of Informal Patent Application (PTC er:	O-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/700,063

Art Unit: 1725

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 & 6-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Staver et al. (USPN 6,002,706) in view of Dykes et al. (USPN 6,548,782) and Staver et al. (USPN 5,987,042).

Staver et al. ('706) discloses the control of a laser beam used for laser shock peening. The mechanical stresses generated by the laser pulse are typically very sensitive to the characteristics of the laser pulse. Another important parameter is the fluence which has an impact on the compressive stresses generated. A known method of estimating laser areas is by using coupons or films. The apparatus comprises a beam splitter which divides the laser beam into a first portion and a second portion, a lens which focuses the first portion of the laser beam for incidence on a target, a detector which receives the second portion of the laser beam and which generates a signal representative of a spatial energy distribution of the laser beam, a digitizer which digitizes the signal from the detector, a data analyzer which receives the digitized signal from the digitizer which calculates a fluence distribution of the laser beam and a lens controller for adjusting a position of the lens with respect to the target based on the

Application/Control Number: 10/700,063

Art Unit: 1725

fluence distribution. The method and apparatus can be used to improve industrial processes such as laser shock peening by monitoring and controlling the fluence of the laser beam. (abstract, figures, col. 1, lines 31-61, col. 2, lines 12-36).

Staver et al. ('706) does not specifically teach the use of an overlay, a controller or a laser with Q-switch and a clock signal.

Dykes et al. disclose a laser shock peening system, which uses an overlay. The laser beam (16) irradiates the workpiece (20) having an overlay (40) while a measurement device (15) measures the thickness of the both overlays (paint and water). The location of the measurement device may be located either near or outside the processing chamber. A control unit, such as a controller (28) is connected to the overlay, the workpiece, the measurement device, laser, positioning mechanism and so forth. Thus the system may be controlled real-time during the laser shock peening process. (abstract, figures, col. 4, lines 31-35, col. 6, col. 7, lines 25-67, col. 8, lines 10-53, col. 9, lines 34-47, col. 10, lines 45-51)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use an overlay and a controller, as taught by Dykes et al. in the Staver et al. ('706) system because the laser shock process may be controlled in-process or real-time and yield a product which meets desired parameters or predetermined ranges.

Additionally, the overlay is merely a variation of the laser shock peening process.

Staver et al. ('042) discloses a laser shocking processing system that improves workpiece surface characteristics by the formation of a surface layer in the material, which is in a state of compression. Typically, these systems use a transparent inertial

Art Unit: 1725

confinement layer such as water. Laser pulses have to be controlled by a master clock trigger in order to optimize the exposure of the workpiece to laser peening. Actively controlling the relative timing of the laser pulse and the opening of the optical switch will result in a defined pulse that has a shape for effectively generating the desired mechanical stresses in the laser shock peened workpiece (target). The pulse generator controls the laser by actuating a high voltage relay, powered by a high voltage power supply that opens and closes the Q-switch in the laser oscillator. (abstract, figures, col. 1-2, col. 3, lines 22-50)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a laser with Q-switch and a clock signal, as taught by Staver et al. ('042) in the Staver et al. ('706) system because well defined and accurately spaced laser shock peening pulses will effectively generate the desired mechanical stresses in the laser shock peening workpiece (target).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4-5 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the claims as supported by the specification differs from the prior art in that it

Art Unit: 1725

does not teach a system for laser shock peening having a logical AND gate coupled to the detector and pinhole aperture aligned with the detector.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments (6/16/05) with respect to claims have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Alexandra Elve whose telephone number is 571-272-1173. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-3:00 Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Dunn can be reached on 571-272-1171. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/700,063

Art Unit: 1725

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

August 18, 2005.

M. Alexandra Elve

Primary Examiner 1725